

Science and Religion in a Nutshell

By GEORGE McCREADY PRICE

Author of

"Back to the Bible;" "Q. E. D., or New Light on the Doctrine
of Creation;" "The Fundamentals of Geology;" "The
New Geology, a Textbook for Colleges;" etc.



REVIEW & HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

Washington, D. C.

South Bend, Ind.

Peekskill, N. Y.

Printed in the U. S. A.

Copyright, 1923, by
REVIEW & HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

CONTENTS

I.	RISE OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION	-	-	7
II.	THE GREAT MODERN APOSTASY	-	-	14
III.	SOME GEOLOGICAL FACTS	-	-	20
IV.	ADDITIONAL FACTS FROM THE ROCKS	-		27
V.	THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF CREATION	-		34
VI.	THE PRESENT SITUATION	-	-	41
VII.	CREATION AND ITS MEMORIAL	-	-	53

CHAPTER I

RISE OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

MANY centuries ago men noticed sea shells on the tops of the mountains and strange bones of prehistoric monsters buried in the rocks. The general interpretation given to these relics was that they had been buried in these places by the Deluge, or Flood, as mentioned in the Bible. This was, of course, a very natural interpretation. It was not alone the casual discoverers of these relics who gave them this interpretation; for a long time after the facts had been gathered into a more or less scientific form, or even down past the beginning of the nineteenth century, this was at least one of the ways of accounting for these facts, as taught by some of the leading scientists of those days.

In some research work which I did recently in Washington, D. C., I had the privilege of spending a good deal of time in the Library of Congress, and still more in the geological library connected with the United States Geological Survey, which has perhaps the best collection of geological works in the world. In the course of these studies I had the opportunity of looking over many old books, some dating back two hundred years or even more; and the general attitude taken was that the Flood must be regarded as the real cause of the chief geological changes. I myself own a large work in two volumes, published in 1825, a well-written, scholarly treatise, in which the author takes this ground; also

another less pretentious work, dated 1838. I remember also seeing in one of the libraries mentioned above, several other works in which this view is maintained, one or two dated as late as 1850.

But the rationalistic scientists, that is, those who did not like too strong a reminder of the Flood, tried to invent a theory which would possibly account for some of the facts without the necessity of any great catastrophe or any very obvious reminder of an event so clearly a direct "act of God." A very plausible way to avoid the idea of a great world catastrophe would be to have a long succession of small, local catastrophes, one following another in a series. Still better (from their point of view) would it be to do away with the idea of a catastrophe altogether, and explain all the events recorded in the rocks in accordance with the quiet, everyday action of the elements of nature. But the latter idea could be plausibly maintained only by also appealing to almost unlimited time, dragging out the process through millions and millions of years.

And we find by examining the history of the science that both these ideas have been appealed to,—the idea of a long series of world catastrophes, in each of which all the kinds of life then living were blotted out of existence, followed by an effort to smooth out the too abrupt passage from one kind of life, or one "age," to the one succeeding it, the latter being practically the view still prevailing. In this way we have the modern scientifically popular doctrine of *uniformity*, a doctrine which, when applied to geology, means the idea that all the changes in the past history of the earth, as recorded in the rocks, took place by quiet, gradual processes similar to the various processes which *they say* are all the time going on around us, quite unobserved by most people. In other words, this doctrine of scientific uniformity is

a direct and positive denial of the record of a universal Deluge. The one is the direct opposite of the other; and if one is true, the other must of necessity be absolutely false.

Without entering further into the details of the history of the rise of this modern doctrine of uniformity, it will be in order here to explain the various attempts which have been made by Christian people to meet the current teachings of geology, and to "harmonize" the latter with the record of the first chapters of Genesis.

I have already mentioned the one explanation which says that the geological changes, as found in the rocks, are the results of the world Deluge. But besides this explanation, two, and only two, other attempts have been made to harmonize the facts of the rocks with the record of the first chapters of Genesis. And a brief statement regarding these two attempted explanations must now be given:

1. The first in point of time was what is generally called the "interval theory," or the "restitution theory." So far as I know, it was first taught by the celebrated Scotch preacher, Thomas Chalmers, about 1812 or 1814. It was taken up by Buckland, a teacher of geology at Oxford, and was made popular by these men and also by Cardinal Wiseman, a Roman Catholic prelate, and others. According to this view, the record in the first verses of Genesis was said to indicate that an interval or a break had occurred after "the beginning," and before the creation proper of our present world was begun. This interval, they said, may have been millions and millions of years long; and they said that during this long, indefinite period all the geological changes which we find recorded in the rocks could have taken place.

It is obvious that this theory allows that these long-drawn-out ages of the geologists have a real basis in

fact, or had a real existence. That is, it concedes the scientific accuracy of this elaborate time scale of the current geology. And it also takes for granted (what was universally taught a hundred years ago) that all the kinds of plants and animals found as fossils in the rocks are remains of species *entirely extinct*, and that they have no connection whatever with the various kinds of plants and animals in our world today.

But in the light of modern knowledge, both these assumptions are now known to be false. The first to be overthrown was the idea that all the species found as fossils are really "extinct" species. This doctrine has been as hard to kill as the proverbial nine-lived cat; but it is now acknowledged by all well-informed scientists that we have in the rocks tens of thousands of distinct kinds of life that are practically identical with the kinds which are living in our world today. And in the light of this fact it has become increasingly unreasonable to suppose that the Lord made all these kinds of life, and then blotted them all out of existence, one after another, and then went to work at the beginning of our present world and again created similar forms, practical duplicates of the myriads of kinds which were long ago buried in the rocks. To this is added the unreasonableness of supposing that there were millions and millions of years of suffering and death among the lower kinds of life before sin had ever entered our world; for these long ages of suffering and death have no moral meaning at all under such circumstances. But in the next place it was discovered, as we shall see in the sequel, that these supposed "ages" of the geologists are without a single particle of fact to support them, that in fact this geological time scale is the most flimsy and baseless idea that a spirit of speculation ever imported into the realms of science.

Accordingly, it would seem that this "interval," or "restitution," theory would not need to be considered by us today as a serious proposal by which to harmonize the facts of geology with the record in Genesis. And it is not put forward by any one who is acquainted with the scientific facts in the case, though it is sometimes mentioned in a timid, apologetic way by some people, chiefly theologians, who wish to take the first part of the Bible just as it reads, and yet admit evolutionary geology.

2. The second of the theories referred to above is commonly called the "day-period" theory. This term sufficiently explains its leading idea. From about the middle of the nineteenth century on to near its close, this view was taught by such men as Hugh Miller, Sir William Dawson, Prof. James D. Dana, and many others, that the "days" mentioned in the first of Genesis should not be taken literally, but should be understood in a liberal way as referring to long, indefinite periods of time, each period being thousands or possibly millions of years in length. In the early history of this theory there was even a serious attempt to go into details, and to show how the various events recorded in Genesis as having taken place one after another, really fitted in with the successive conditions or states of our planet as pictured by popular geology. But of late years, with the increasing detailed knowledge of the kinds of plants and animals found in the rocks, it has become more and more difficult to make any serious effort to harmonize the "days" of creation with the "periods" of geology.

About the last notable instance of an actual attempt to harmonize the two was made by Gladstone in his celebrated discussion with Huxley, in the eighties of the last century. Huxley's easy and conclusive proof

that the harmony between the days of Genesis and the periods of geology is much more imaginary than real, practically put an end to this theory, except as a loose, careless way of seeking to smooth out the differences between the popular teachings of science and the teachings of the Bible about the beginnings of things.

But for nearly fifty years this day-period theory has been the only serious attempt at harmonizing the supposed facts of modern geology with the record in Genesis. If it has fallen into disrepute within recent years, it has only been because most people have felt the absurdity of admitting the reality of these long geological ages, with the gradual advance in the various types of life, and yet denying the natural genetic connection between these successive types of life, or denying that the earlier and more rudimentary must somehow have gradually developed into the later and more highly organized. In other words, most people see the absurdity of admitting the geological ages and yet denying the evolution doctrine. And as they all believe the former, they have felt compelled to believe the latter. As Huxley long ago declared that Charles Lyell and his geology "was the chief agent in smoothing the road for Darwin," so far as he was concerned; so now we see that this system of geology has been in reality the chief reason why the modern world has so eagerly and almost universally accepted the doctrine of evolution.

When this idea of long ages of time during which the world was developing, was first put forward, not many people saw its true import. But now that this theory has been before the world for nearly a century, and as it has had a full opportunity to develop and show its real meaning, we begin to see that it is really one of the worst and most anti-Christian theories ever foisted upon a credulous world. For not only does this idea

throw discredit upon the whole Scriptural record of the beginnings of our world; we now see that through its modern developments it strikes also at every fundamental doctrine of historic Christianity. We see that when the basic idea of Creation is removed or discredited, the whole structure of revealed religion is vitally endangered.

The most timely truth for our day is a reform which will point this generation of evolutionists back to Creation, and to the worship of Him who made the heaven and the earth. Other reforms in other days have been based upon various parts of the Bible here and there. The reform most needed in our day is one based on the first part of the Bible — and upon the last part also. For he who is looking for the return of his Lord, and for the imminent ushering in of the new heaven and the new earth, must necessarily believe in the record of the first part of the Bible, which tells of the Creation of the earth. Surely it is useless to expect people to believe in the predictions given in the last chapters of the Bible, if they do not believe in the record of the events described in its first chapters.

CHAPTER II

THE GREAT MODERN APOSTASY

IN order to realize the striking change which has come over our modern world, we have only to hark back to about the middle of the nineteenth century, or some seventy-five years ago. At that time the great majority of people believed in the Bible as the word of God. All questions of morals or religion were settled by comparison with this book as the great and supreme guide of human life. Its record of the beginnings of things was held to be reliable and authentic; its account of the fall of man, of the universal Deluge, and the Confusion of Tongues, was looked upon as true history; and all ideas of ethics, sociology, or even politics, were discussed in the light of these great waymarks along the pathway of history. All doctrines were settled, all questions of right and wrong were decided, and all problems relating to the individual, family, or public life were solved by an appeal to that collection of writings which was universally held to be a true Revelation of the will of our Creator.

But today many people for whom Christian workers attempt to labor, take what the Bible says at more or less of a discount, if indeed they consider its declarations worthy of any consideration whatever. In a great majority of instances, it is not sufficient to convince a person that certain truths are clearly taught in the Bible, or taught, let us say, in the first part of the Bible; we must begin by convincing him that the first part of the Bible is something more than a mere record of

the strivings of a Semitic people who had an extraordinary capacity for high and noble thoughts. For instance, if we try to teach the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath, we shall have little success in our work unless we can establish faith in the record given in the Bible of the origin of this institution. Indeed, there is little doubt that the modern world-wide disregard of Sabbath observance is largely due to the prevailing loss of belief in the divine record of how the Sabbath originated and of what it really stands for. For if a man believes that life has existed on the globe for a hundred million years, and that the human race itself has been slowly evolved from the lower forms of animal life; in short, if he does not believe that there ever was a real Creation at some definite time in the past, how can we expect him to observe the Sabbath as a memorial of that event, which in his view never occurred?

In reality, we have in these very facts one of the chief difficulties of convincing people regarding some of the most important reforms needed at the present day. For not only is the Sabbath meaningless to an evolutionist, or to a believer in the ordinary teachings of geology, but how can we hope to impress such a person with the imminence of the events predicted in the last chapters of the Bible, when he has lost all confidence in the history recorded in its first chapters?

In short, we are constantly impressed with the apostle Peter's accuracy in describing the people of the last days as scoffing at the prediction of the second coming of Christ, because they declare that "since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." 2 Peter 3:4. And the apostle says that these scoffers talk thus because they "wilfully forget" that the world was once destroyed by the waters of a Flood, and that the same God who once

destroyed it in this way, is waiting only for the fulness of time to destroy it the second time by fire. (See 2 Peter 3: 3-10.)

It is the teachings of modern science that have chiefly contributed to bring about this great change in the opinions of thousands in the rank and file of the people. For two generations, the educational systems of all civilized countries have taught that the world is many millions of years old; and while not all educators have agreed that man has grown up from the apes by a biological evolution, yet no modernly educated man (unless he has found the real truth in geology) for a moment believes, literally and exactly as it reads, the record in Genesis regarding the origin of things.

But the doctrine of the fall of man is just as essentially a part of the Christian religion as is the doctrine of Christ's mediatorial work. As Blatchford, the English socialist, expresses it:

"But — no Adam, no fall; no fall, no atonement; no atonement, no Saviour. Accepting evolution, how can we believe in a fall? When did man fall? Was it before he ceased to be a monkey, or after? Was it when he was a tree man, or later? Was it in the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, or in the Age of Iron? . . . And if there never was a fall, why should there be any atonement?"

This expression of Blatchford's is no stronger than the logic of the case demands. Indeed, the history of the modern apostasy shows conclusively that when men lose their faith in a real creation, the next step is to deny the reality of the fall, and then to deny the reality of, and the necessity for, the atonement. The average modern man is simply following out the logical consequences of his major premise. And as the result of such teachings for more than half a century, the rising generation has never been taught the great truths lying at the foundation of the Christian religion. We

are accustomed to calling "heathen" those who have not from their youth up known the truths of the fall and the atonement; but on this basis we are surrounded on every side, even in America and in Europe, by people who are just as truly heathen in their beliefs as are the people of India or China. And our efforts for them can never be completely successful until we grasp the reality of this condition, and work for them as we would for heathen in any other part of the world.

It is not suitable, in such a brief sketch as this, to go into the history of the development of the evolution doctrine. However, it may be noted in passing that the first wrong method was introduced in the early days of geology, when it was quietly assumed that there never was a great universal Deluge, but that the changes recorded in the rocks came about in the long ago by the quiet, orderly action of the elements, similar to the changes now taking place all around us. In this way, the long-drawn-out ages of geology, with which the world is now so familiar, were built up by hasty speculators and treated as an actual fact. The next step in the history of this false system of science was made by Charles Darwin, who undertook to show how one kind of plant or animal might possibly grow and develop into another and distinct type of life. In other words, the "ages" of geology plus Darwinism equal evolution, the latter term being used for the larger aspects of the theory which seeks to show how all forms of life have grown up in a natural way, without any real creation.

But it is a curious fact that many people who believe in the evolution doctrine, stop abruptly and refuse to believe in it as applied to the origin of man. Even Alfred Russel Wallace, the co-inventor with Charles Darwin of the evolution theory, halted his scheme of evolution when it came to man; and taught that while

man possibly derived his bodily form from the apes, yet even here a special providence had intervened to form a brain and a hand and many other organs which man could never have inherited from the lower animals. Many modern scholars are so far inconsistent as to believe in evolution for all the lower forms of life, and yet to say that man was formed in some way which was an exception to the general rule.

However, these inconsistencies need not concern us here. It is sufficient for our purpose to note that, as the result of the widespread acceptance of these false teachings of science, the people have almost universally departed from the simple faith of our forefathers concerning the origin of our world; and very few of them believe in the first chapters of the Bible in the common-sense way, just as they are written.

But there are many times seven thousand who have not willingly bowed the knee to this modern Baal. These persons are quite decided in their acceptance of the Bible as the real word of God, and equally decided in their repudiation of the doctrine of the ape-origin of man. But they find themselves more or less in the fog when they have to deal with such subjects as geology or the details of the relation between science and religion. They feel the need of a better way of handling the matter than the customary attempts to "harmonize" the teachings of geology with Genesis, yet they do not know of any better way. It has been the experience of the writer that when the recent discoveries in geology are placed before them,—discoveries which confirm so fully the record of a universal Deluge, and which thus put out of consideration the ordinary scheme of evolution,—these friends of the Bible very eagerly welcome the new light, and are glad of a basis for accepting the whole Bible in the old-fashioned way.

And these friends of the Bible need the help which this new view of the scientific aspects of the problem will give them. Theirs is a hard fight; indifference to, and even active opposition against, the Bible are assisted by the traitorous betrayal of the most sacred truths of Christianity by great numbers of ministers and theological teachers who are supposed to be its defenders. But these new views regarding Creation and the Deluge will greatly strengthen the hands of the defenders of the Bible, making easier their work of teaching Bible truths, because Christians can now be consistent and believe in the whole of the Bible in the old-fashioned way, a consistency which made so successful the work of Luther and Knox, of Wesley, Spurgeon, and Moody. And the need of the hour is for a modern generation of Christians who believe in the truths of the Bible in the same unquestioning and unqualified way as did these prophets of former years.

CHAPTER III

SOME GEOLOGICAL FACTS

COMPARATIVELY few persons have ever studied geology, and even fewer understand the real principles of the science. Most people know more or less about a few kinds of rocks; or they may have seen in some museum the skeletons of a number of strange, unearthly-looking animals which have been dug up from the rocks. Most people have also become familiar with the idea, so persistently taught on every side, that these animals lived many millions of years ago, and practically everybody except a few here and there believes that these animals did live actually many millions of years ago. Little children in the public schools are taught this as an actual fact.

Geology is admittedly a difficult subject. One of the reasons for this is, that it builds on the results of all other sciences. A familiarity with at least the elements of physics, astronomy, chemistry, mineralogy, physical geography, botany, and zoology is necessary for any full understanding of geology; and the more of any or all of these sciences one knows, the better is his preparation for the study of geology.

An acquaintance with any of these sciences can be obtained only as a result of many years of study; still more is it necessary for one who hopes to attain to eminence in geology to begin its study early in life and pursue it devotedly for the greater part of his lifetime. The result of all these conditions is that the young student usually begins the study of geology too early in

life to have had any adequate preparation for the work, and accordingly in his first studies he is much disposed to take things merely on the assertion of his instructors or of the books he may read. Such a beginner is unable to separate the facts of the science from mere hypotheses or theories; and while acquiring a general fund of knowledge of the facts, he also takes on a considerable load of mere theories. As this process and this method of study have gone on year after year, the science as ordinarily taught has become a strange mixture of fact and fiction, the latter being not only utterly contrary to the Bible, but also in many instances quite manifestly contrary to common sense and to the results obtained in the various other sciences.

For two generations or more the governments of all civilized countries have had large numbers of highly trained men organized into what are termed Geological Survey staffs. These men are employed at government expense to study the rocks in various parts of the country, and the results of their studies are published at government expense in the form of "Reports." Most of these geologists are hard-working men who wish to tell only the truth; but all their previous training has tended to impress upon their minds, with all the force of absolute fact, what are merely *theories* of the science. Thus these government reports have for all these years been equivalent to a wholesale official propaganda in favor of the evolution theory, carried on at government expense by the official and highly respected and well-salaried representatives of practically all the governments on earth.

But the great outstanding facts regarding the rocks are open to the observation of all; and thinking people want an explanation of them. The masses of sea shells found high on the tops of the mountains, the great beds

of plant remains found as seams of coal a half mile down in the ground, or the huge carcasses of elephants, rhinoceroses, and other animals found in the ice away up near the North Pole, are facts which speak of former conditions vastly different from the conditions of sea and land and climate now prevailing. The whole earth is indeed a vast graveyard; its rocky tombstones contain inscriptions of the death and burial of countless myriads, written by nature herself in the very act of burying these remains, but these inscriptions can be deciphered only with painstaking care. Yet if they are correctly read, we must of necessity learn the secret of how these stupendous changes took place, and may possibly learn something of the conditions formerly prevailing.

In the words of Tennyson,

“There rolls the deep where grew the tree.
O earth, what changes hast thou seen!
There where the long street roars, hath been
The stillness of the central sea.”

The words of William Cullen Bryant are even more true regarding the animals buried in the rocks than regarding the human beings that have since been buried, when he says that —

“All that tread
The globe are but a handful to the tribes
That slumber in its bosom.”

When and how were all these creatures buried? True, we find them in sandstone or limestone or shale, as the case may be, and we know that they must have been buried *by moving water*. But was it just the common everyday action of the streams and the seas which made these enormous deposits of rock? Did the great

and remarkable changes of climate which they indicate take place in a slow, gradual way? Are similar changes continually taking place all around us, only so slowly as to be scarcely perceptible? Or was it possibly the Flood which made these vast deposits of rock, burying these myriads in their stony graves, and changing the climate of the globe and the whole arrangement of the land and water?

If we say that common, everyday causes produced these changes, we shall have to allow many millions of years for the process, while if we assign the Flood as the cause, we must suppose this universal Deluge to have been a much more important event, and to have produced vastly greater changes, than has been generally supposed. These two alternative explanations of the facts of the rocks have been long before the world. The former explanation, which makes it a process of many millions of years, has been quite generally adopted, and has led to the popular teachings of geology and the widespread acceptance of the evolution doctrine. But the universal Deluge as the cause of these changes would seem to be the more natural explanation, in the light of Bible narrative. Which explanation shall we adopt? Is there anything in the rocks themselves that can definitely settle the matter in the one way or the other? If we study these things in a truly scientific manner, can we not be reasonably certain of our conclusions, and definitely settle these questions, just as a coroner's jury might settle once for all the cause and the manner of a certain person's death? In reality, geologists, or students of the rocks, are only coroners in a wider sense; for over every fossil bone or shell which they find in the rocks they must hold a post-mortem, and decide as best they can how these creatures were buried; and a truly scientific study of these problems ought to be adequate to

settle once for all these great problems regarding the past history of our earth.

In some instances, it is true, we require a very profound knowledge of many phases of nature in order to bring in a true verdict at the close of our post-mortem investigation. But in studying such examples as the elephants found frozen in the ice of Arctic Siberia, it would seem that only one conclusion is possible. These animals are found in the frozen soil, with their flesh so well preserved that the dogs and wolves eat it greedily; and in several instances, companies of scientists have also had a meal from this ancient meat which has been kept in cold storage for so many centuries. Quite plainly these animals must have been frozen *almost immediately after they died*; and just as plainly we conclude that this could have been done only by a sudden and extreme change of the climate of the whole arctic regions, perhaps of the whole globe.

For these animals are found in immense numbers over wide regions of country. They are thrifty-looking, many of them larger and better developed than any elephants of India or Africa at the present time. Their stomachs are full of undigested food, showing, as one scientist expresses it, "that they were quietly feeding when the crisis came." There is not sufficient vegetation now in these regions to support even a musk ox or a reindeer, much less great herds of elephants; for these elephant remains are found in abundance much farther north than any land animals now exist.

That no slow or gradual, but a sudden and extensive, change of climate is here indicated, is as plain and inevitable a conclusion as would be a verdict of violent death if we found a dead man with several bullet holes through his head and body. In the words of Dana, the great geologist, the mild, summer-like climate which

these animals were enjoying must have been "abruptly terminated," and must have become "suddenly extreme, as of a single winter's night." Other considerations show that this change of climate must have affected the whole world; and the conclusion is almost inevitable that this sudden change of climate must in some manner have been connected with the events of the Deluge.

There are other considerations which seem to show just as plainly and conclusively that the events which took place in that olden time were sudden and in the nature of an awful catastrophe. For example, when we find fossils in the rocks, such as fishes, we usually find them in such great quantities — perhaps miles in extent, and packed, one on top of another, through many feet of vertical measurement — that it is childish to think of any ordinary action of the elements as being the cause of these conditions. Our scientific knowledge of the world has settled it that only a few scattered fragments here and there are all that are now being buried by our modern rivers or seas in any part of the world; whereas the fishes of which I have spoken are found by the billion, and in such a perfect state of preservation as to indicate that they were either buried alive, or at least before decomposition of the soft parts of their bodies had taken place.

Similar conditions are found in the case of many varieties of shellfish, in the case of the plant remains which have since been converted into coal, or even in the case of those gigantic monsters known as dinosaurs, whose huge mounted skeletons are the astonishment of all visitors to a natural history museum.

Other lines of geological evidence also tend to show that the causes which produced the death and burial of these various types of life, were sudden and violent in their action, and quite different, both in degree and in

kind, from any causes now operating in our world. Indeed, almost every bed of sandstone or limestone or shale of the older rocks found anywhere throughout the world, contains within itself clear and unmistakable evidence that it was formed by the action of running water which was then operating in some manner quite different from anything now going on anywhere on earth.

To sum it all up, we may say that the evidence is now abundant and conclusive that the rocks composing our mountain ranges and underlying our fields and forests, contain within their very structure telltale proofs that some sudden and awful catastrophe must have overtaken our world sometime in the long ago. The details of this evidence cannot be presented in this brief sketch; but they will be found in such works as "The Fundamentals of Geology," and "Q. E. D., or New Light on the Doctrine of Creation," and other works by the present writer.¹ In the light of modern discoveries the old theories of uniformity and evolution will not suffice. These theories have had a fair chance and an open field for more than two generations, but they have become wholly inadequate as an explanation of the facts now known regarding the rocks in all parts of the world. In other words, evolutionary geology is seen to be bankrupt as a theory to account for the facts of the rocks; and the older theory of a universal Deluge, which has been laid aside for more than half a century, is now seen to be by far the best explanation after all.

¹ NOTE.— See also, "The New Geology, a Textbook for Colleges." (1923).

CHAPTER IV

ADDITIONAL FACTS FROM THE ROCKS

IN previous pages we gave some facts which show that the chief geological changes recorded in the rocks must have been accomplished in a sudden and violent manner. The evidence for this is that fishes, shellfish, and other creatures are found buried in immense hecatombs, gigantic graveyards, often miles in extent, wherein uncounted myriads of those creatures appear to have been destroyed by some sudden or violent catastrophe. These conditions are of course not universal around the earth; but they occur in so many instances and in such widely scattered localities, and comprise so many various orders or kinds of creatures, that they may be said to constitute a universal phenomenon of the rocks.

Geologists, it is true, always admit the abnormal conditions in each single or particular instance; but according to their evolutionary theory they arrange these various catastrophes in a prolonged series, separated by long ages of what they term quiet and normal action. This is indeed the keynote of their system. But as has been shown, there is absolutely no scientific evidence to prove that these various catastrophes were merely local in extent, and occurred one after the other during long ages of time. The geological teaching that they occurred in a serial order during successive ages, is a pure assumption, without any scientific proof. It is

really much more scientific to correlate all these various abnormal events as *merely parts of one great world catastrophe*; and then these events assume a familiar form, and become merely the scientific aspects of that great event during which "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." 2 Peter 3: 6.

In a previous paragraph we also spoke of the evidences of a sudden and world-wide change of climate. That a wonderful climate, springlike and balmy, seems to have prevailed over the entire globe, is abundantly proved by other conditions besides the elephants and different animals found frozen in the ice of the arctic regions. For example, in many localities the arctic regions contain rocks full of certain kinds of corals; and we know that corals cannot exist except in warm water which maintains a steady temperature of nearly 80° F. These corals are widely distributed in the arctic regions, and they show that during their lifetime a mild climate must have prevailed over all that part of the world.

Another evidence tending in the same direction is furnished by the immense coal deposits abounding in those regions. Every one has heard of the coal beds of Alaska; but not all are aware that these coal deposits seem to grow richer and better as we go northward. Cape Lisburne, a point of land some three hundred miles north of Nome and about one hundred sixty miles within the arctic circle, contains forty or fifty successive beds of coal, ten of them being each four feet thick, and one more than thirty feet through.

The leaves of the plants composing this coal are well preserved in the rocks, and consist of ferns, horsetails, club mosses, with cycads and palms, which now live only in warm, semitropical regions. We can well understand why the Government bulletin describing these coal deposits says that they indicate "a mild and probably

frostless climate." But at the present time this region is cold and desolate, the soil is frozen many hundreds of feet down, and thaws out only enough on top during the short summer to allow a scanty vegetation of the hardiest herbs and shrubs to appear.

All these facts, with others that might be given, are conclusive evidence that our world once enjoyed a climate of uninterrupted springlike mildness. If we considered these coal beds alone, there might be some chance to suppose that the change from that climate to the present one of terrific extremes of heat and cold was a gradual process; but the moment we begin to speak of a gradual change of climate, those elephant mummies, so splendidly preserved by nature's system of cold storage, rise up before us to testify that the change was not gradual, but sudden, indeed sudden beyond human comprehension.

Some who are unacquainted with the geological facts have supposed that these remains in the arctic regions merely indicate that these regions constituted the tropics of that ancient world, and that at that same time some other portion of the world was suffering the rigors of an arctic climate. But there is no scientific evidence whatever, either geological, astronomical, paleontological, or any other sort, to prove or to hint that the poles were ever in any other position than where they are at present. And I do not know of any scientist who holds the view that the great change of climate which is so evident from the study of fossils, was due to the shifting of the polar regions. Indeed, the evidence is all the other way. There are proofs, which need not be enumerated here, which show conclusively that this mild climate was formerly universal over the whole globe.

The generally larger size of the fossils found in the rocks, is another fact of much significance in this con-

nection. I do not wish to convey the idea that all the fossils which we find in the rocks are abnormal monsters. True, there are some huge, unearthly-looking monsters, some of them seventy or eighty feet long, the bones of which are found in Wyoming, Nebraska, and elsewhere. There are two such creatures in the Carnegie Museum at Pittsburgh, Pa., and one whole animal and parts of many others, nearly as large, in the Natural History Museum of New York. But I refer to the fossil remains of lobsters and clams and fishes and butterflies and bears and lions, and indeed almost the whole range of animal life. For practically all the fossils furnish specimens which are larger and more thrifty-looking than similar kinds alive at the present time. It is also a very significant fact that this characteristic of larger size is common to all the kinds of fossils found in all the various "formations," and in all parts of the globe; and that when we pass over into our modern world, the change in the appearance of the fossils is just as sudden and complete as is that of climate.

Another very important aspect of modern discovery has to do with the conditions now prevailing around our ocean borders and on the deep floor of the ocean itself.

It was formerly taught that parts of the coast of Greenland, Sweden, Italy, and other countries, are rising slowly and gradually above the sea, and other parts are gradually settling beneath the waters. It is true there are old shore lines or raised beaches around all the continents, in some places fifty or one hundred or five hundred feet above the present level of the ocean. In other places we have submerged forests, with the stumps of trees still visible beneath the water hundreds of feet out from the shore. However, these are an evidence, not of gradual, but of *sudden* changes of level; while the

raised beaches at least are inseparably connected with the other vast geological changes which took place in the great long ago, and cannot be separated from them in explanation.

In addition to this, it was long supposed that definite markings placed on the shores of the Baltic and elsewhere during the last hundred years, tend to prove that changes of sea level are now going on. But a very full and complete examination of this supposed evidence has been made in recent years by some of the leading scientists, such as Sir Henry Howorth and Professor Suess; and their conclusion is that there is no sufficient evidence of this supposed gradual change of sea level, the latter author declaring that "displacements susceptible of measurement have not occurred within the historic period."

Thus another of the teachings of evolutionary science turns out to be merely a myth, without any substantial facts in its support. The sea coasts of the continents are not now on the seesaw, up and down; and this alleged modern movement, which turns out to be based upon mistakes, cannot be appealed to in order to explain the great changes of sea and land which we find recorded in the rocks. These past changes of the sea and the land were wholly abnormal, and are without any explanation from alleged similar changes which were once supposed to be still going on.

It was long taught that in our deep seas and oceans the currents are all the time wearing away in some places and building up in others. Therefore it was supposed to be necessary only for these beds of sandstone or limestone, which had been formed beneath the ocean, to be lifted up above the waters, in order to constitute the lands as we now find them, where mountains and plains are composed of strata of limestone containing corals or

crinoids, alternating with sandstone containing shellfish, and shales full of the leaves of land plants.

But the investigations of the "Challenger" Expedition (1872-76), which was sent out by the British government, with other similar expeditions which have since been organized by the American and other governments, have proved that the bottom of the ocean is not being subjected to any such movements of the waters. The ocean currents do not extend below a thousand or two thousand feet, while the movements made by the mightiest storms are even more superficial in their action. On the contrary, over the whole bottom of the ocean there is a perpetual calm.

Around the borders of the oceans, extending out in some places a hundred miles more or less, the waves and currents are still at work, and deposits brought down from the land by the rivers and streams, are still being laid down. But as all kinds of sediment tend to be precipitated about twenty-five times as rapidly in salt water as in fresh, these sediments brought down from the land never get very far from the shore. The result is that there is what is termed a "continental shelf," or border, around all the continents, on which these deposits are still accumulating, but beyond which they do not extend. Indeed, the true oceanic area begins with the edge of this continental shelf; and from this edge, the bottom rapidly sinks to the general level of the ocean floor.

Over this bottom of the ocean, with its cold, dark waters, there are no beds of sand or clay now being shifted or deposited; nothing but the slow accumulation of the slimy ooze formed by the silent dropping into these depths of the minute fragments of the millions of creatures, many of them microscopic in size, which live and die in the surface waters from one to six miles overhead. No gravel, no sand, no clay, is being moved or

disturbed from end to end of the whole true bottom of the ocean. The materials now found throughout the whole of this vast extent are absolutely different from any deposits which we have yet discovered as composing the hills and lands of the continents — different, I mean, in their mechanical texture and make-up, and different in their method of formation.

Yet in the chalk cliffs of the south of England, of Kansas, and of many other localities, we have strata hundreds of miles in extent, composed of the very same kinds of microscopic remains which we now find over the larger part of the Atlantic bottom. In other localities we find brachiopods and crinoids, exactly like the modern kinds which live a mile or more down in the depths of the ocean. And the remarkable and telltale fact is that, in all these instances, these relics of the deep ocean are found mixed with or alternating with clays or sands or other material derived from the lands, but these modern land materials are not now associated with these deep-sea animals throughout the whole range of our modern ocean.

Thus in still another way we have evidence that the deposits composing our mountains and plains must have been formed by some very abnormal action of the waters of the ocean. Indeed, whenever we see these kinds of rocks, which now underlie such cities as St. Louis, Chicago, and London, they speak to us of that awful time in the long ago, when "the foundations of the great deep [were] broken up." Practically all the limestone rocks found so generally throughout the world are composed of materials which thus afford us reminders and conclusive proof of the universal Deluge.

Accordingly, we see that wherever we turn, the rocks contain within themselves evidence of the truthfulness of the Scriptural record.

CHAPTER V

THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF CREATION

IN a preceding section we gave some facts regarding the deposits on the bottom of the ocean, showing how different the deposits now forming are from the ancient deposits found in the rocks of the land. These rocks often contain fossils of various kinds of creatures which now live only in the deeper waters of the ocean; but modern investigation has revealed the surprising fact that nothing like a stratified formation of gravel or sand or clay is now being formed anywhere over the deep ocean floor. Hence, we now realize that the rocks composing our hills and mountains must have been formed by some quite abnormal action of the waters of the ocean.

We also showed that there is no evidence that the ocean and the land are now gradually exchanging places around any of our coasts. Small, sudden displacements due to earthquakes have occurred in modern times; but there is absolutely no scientific evidence of those slow, enormous movements up and down of the sea or land, which have so long been the theme of much geological teaching. We conclude from this fact also that the great movements of the waters which are recorded in the rocks, must have been due to some action of the waters which is not going on at the present time.

In other pages we have mentioned evidences of a sudden and world-wide change of climate,—a change as great in difference of temperature as it must have been in suddenness of action. A climate which must have been

mild and delightful, was changed suddenly into the arctic frosts of the polar regions, with no moment of relaxation of this terrific cold since that time; for the carcasses of the animals then destroyed have been kept in the cold storage of a perfect refrigerator even to our own day. Other considerations also give evidence of the suddenness and enormous extent of the changes which then took place in our world.

By correlating all these scattered facts, we have arrived at the general conclusion of a great world catastrophe which at some time in the long ago overtook our earth. This is a truly scientific induction from these many facts; and the abundance of the evidence and its perfectly consistent and unambiguous character, make this conclusion as certain as any other of the conclusions of science. In view of all these facts, and in view of the uniform traditions of every race of men on earth,—even leaving out of consideration the history in the Bible,—the Deluge, or Flood, becomes as certain a historical event as any other fact of history—as certain, for instance, as the conquest of Egypt by the Hyksos, or as the fall of Carthage.

This light which we now have on the reality of the universal Deluge, inevitably clears away a great deal of fog with which the popular evolutionary teachings have surrounded the subject of the early days of our world. We have ample evidence that the world before the Flood enjoyed a climate like that of perpetual spring. It is easy for us to enlarge on the picture, and catch glimpses of that Eden home of our first parents in which the Bible and tradition alike have taught us to believe.

But these new facts of geology also destroy with one sweep all evolutionary schemes of the long-drawn-out development of one kind of animal into another, a kind of idle dreaming which has been the diversion of

nearly two generations of scientists. If there has really been a great world catastrophe, like a universal Deluge, there is no more chance to construct a scheme of Evolution based on the fossil remains found in the earth (and it can never have any other foundation), than there would be to construct a sky-scraping office building on the top of an ant hill. As the mists and fogs of evolutionary speculations clear away, the great truth of a real Creation at some time previous to this world catastrophe, becomes as clear and inevitable as any other fact of existence.

In addition there are several other discoveries of modern science which also point in this same direction, each contributing its share toward the inevitable conclusion of a real Creation as the only explanation of the origin of our world and of the things upon it.

1. The first of these discoveries which we will note here, has a bearing on the origin of matter. Modern science has shown that all the various kinds of substances around us can be resolved into a comparatively few simple substances, which are termed the chemical elements. Still more recently the discoveries connected with radioactivity have tended to show that even these simple substances may be still further simplified.

Connected with these discoveries of radioactivity, is the demonstration, which now appears to be conclusive, that the heavier elements are being constantly changed over into lighter elements by a process of disintegration due to the loss of particles equivalent to some of the emanations given out by radium and similar substances. And the astonishing thing about it is, that we cannot either hasten or retard this process of disintegration by any means at our command. Heat does not hasten the process, nor cold retard it. No known chemical combination to which we can subject these elements seems to tend

in the slightest degree to hasten or retard this process. So far as we can now see, the elements of high atomic weight, as the chemists express it, are slowly but constantly being changed over or broken up by disintegration into other elements of lower atomic weight.

From all this, science presents us with the new and astonishing picture of the substance of our earth as the mechanism of a great clock slowly but surely running down. This arrays science squarely against the theory of evolution, though even the wildest evolutionists never succeeded in spinning a plausible theory as to how the elements originated. Certainly these scientific conclusions are the exact opposite of the theory of evolution as applied to matter. Not the evolution of matter, but the degeneration of matter, is the plain and unmistakable lesson to be drawn from these facts. For whatever transformation the elements pass through in changing from one kind to another, is by loss and not by gain. It is degeneration, and not upward evolution, which science has now opened up before our astonished eyes, by this peep into the ultimate laboratories of nature. And the one large conclusion which we draw from all these facts is that all the substance called matter, the substance that seems to compose our universe, must at some time in the past, I care not when, have been called into existence in some way which we do not see in operation at the present time. We have an abundance of examples of the disintegration, or break-up, of matter, but no example whatever of the opposite. Thus it becomes one of the most recent and most conclusive discoveries of modern science that the matter composing our universe *must have been created*. Our best scientific studies thus help us to see that the substance called matter must in the beginning have been called into existence by the fiat of Him whom we Christians worship as our God, the Creator.

2. It has become a quite familiar fact that the living cannot be obtained from the not-living. This has been expressed in the brief aphorism, "Life only from life." For many years thousands of investigators have vainly sought to get down beneath this sublime fact, and to produce some form of life from lifeless, inorganic matter. But their uniform failure has been like that of those mechanics who have so often tried to invent perpetual motion; the one mistake or failure is of precisely the same character as the other. And just as no educated mechanic of today would waste his time trying to invent perpetual motion, so no enlightened biologist would spend time and energy trying to originate even the lowest form of cell or the tiniest particle of protoplasm. It would be just as sensible for a physician to go out to a graveyard and expect to call back to life a man who had been dead ten years. If such an action as the latter should succeed, all the world would call it a miracle, and say it was due to the direct act of God. In the light of modern scientific knowledge, the turning of the not-living into the living would be just as much a miracle as the raising of the dead.

We should note carefully how all these facts point backward to a real creation. Life is not now originating except from that which is already alive. But at some time in the long ago there was no life whatever on our globe. It is an unthinkable proposition that life has been on our earth from all eternity. All agree that it must have had a beginning. Even the evolutionists have felt that this puzzle of the origin of life is one of the great stumblingstones in the path of their theory. Their hopeless failure in showing how life could have originated by any natural process, is only a demonstration of the fact that the first origin of life must have been due to a direct act of God. This act is called "Creation," and it

is entirely dissimilar to the processes which we now call natural; that is, the processes by which the Creator is now sustaining the living creatures which He has made, and perpetuating new forms of life — processes which we call vegetation and reproduction.

As we have seen that the origin of life must have been due to a direct act of God,— an act so different from anything now going on around us by what we term a “natural process,” that we must regard it as equivalent to a real miracle,— so it is just as conclusive that this exercise of creative power was not confined to one mere particle of protoplasm. It is absolutely certain that the origin of life could have been only by a real creation; and it is almost equally certain that this exercise of creative power might have taken place in various parts of the earth at the same general time, just as the Bible teaches. For if the great Author of nature saw fit to create life at all, why should He stop short with merely one or two bits of the lower forms of life?

All the higher forms of life are now composed of cells, and each individual man, or horse, or tree, or insect, has originated from a single cell. Thus the cells are the bricks, or the architectural units, of which all living forms are composed. The great Architect of the universe must at the beginning have made his own bricks; and when we know that He must have originated the units of which even the lower forms of life are composed, it is reasonable to suppose that He could build what He desired out of these units, at that time in the morning of our world which we call the Creation. Common sense tells us that, in really originating life on our globe, the Creator did not stop with a few specks of protoplasm here and there over the earth. The ability (and the desire) to create life from the not-living, implies the ability to make full-grown trees, or birds, or ani-

mals by the short process which we call Creation, instead of waiting for the growth of months or years, as the Creator has since ordained that these forms of life should reproduce others "after their kind," as is usual in the present order of the world.

Thus in manifold ways we have the great truth of Creation confirmed by the discoveries of modern science. And as these great scientific principles are brought to our attention, we are enabled better to appreciate what it is to have a Creator, and what it is to be a creature. In this respect we have a decided advantage over the people of ancient times, who had no conception of this great truth of Creation as we now understand it. The ancient Greeks and Romans thought that flies and bees and all the smaller forms of life grew up spontaneously from the moist earth. Aristotle, who understood all the science of his day, and who had, in many other respects, no mean knowledge of nature, taught that flies and worms, and even mice and frogs, grew up spontaneously from the ground. These absurd pagan notions continued to be taught even to within two or three hundred years of our own time. Not until the time of Louis Pasteur (1822-95), was it settled once for all that the living cannot come by any natural process from the not-living. It is only by the progress of modern scientific discoveries that we have learned how to appreciate this great truth of a Creation utterly different from the processes by which the same Creator is now sustaining the world which He made.

We remember that the Sabbath was given to mankind as a memorial of a completed Creation, and thus it is especially appropriate for this present age, not only as a memorial of a real Creation, but as a protest against any false theory of the origin of things.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRESENT SITUATION

No doubt many people who have been suckled in a scientific creed which the world has now for some time recognized as outworn, will be shocked to be told bluntly of the present scientific situation. But it is a fact, and a very interesting fact, from our point of view, that the things which passed as scientific truths twenty or thirty years ago, are now known to have been merely the passing phases of scientific thought, based largely on blunders, or at the most, merely the dim gropings in the dark after elusive truth. But the interesting fact for us is that the newer developments, or the newer light on these subjects, all tends very strongly to confirm the truths of that Divine Record which has been given to us concerning the early days of our world.

In a general way it may be said that scientific truth is obtained as a result of men's endeavors to read God's larger book, the great book of nature. And we are all satisfied that where the book of nature is read aright, the lessons read from it must always be found to agree with the teachings given in the Bible. But when men are groping their way among the intricacies of natural science, they often stumble and make serious mistakes. The same, of course, is true with regard to the study of the Bible. But it is more especially true in the study of the book of nature, because of this very important fact that the world in its present state is quite different, and in some respects entirely and radically different, from the condition of that Eden world fresh from the

hand of God which its Maker pronounced in all respects to be "very good." Not only has the blight of sin come in to mar the handiwork of the great Master Artist, but the world-wide changes which took place at the time of the Flood so completely changed the face of nature, notably in the climate all over the earth, and in the case of the plants and animals now living upon it, that he who undertakes to read the truth concerning the origin of things as based on this disfigured edition of what the Lord originally made, is almost sure to go astray.

It is also the case that where men have attempted in a sledge-hammer fashion to unlock the secrets of nature, often prompted by a spirit of vanity or even by a spirit of active opposition toward Christianity, they must inevitably reach wrong conclusions. Too often, as it seems, people in such a state of mind are led, doubtless quite unconsciously to themselves, by a subtle spirit of evil, which uses the results obtained in such work for the dissemination of falsehoods concerning nature which seem to throw disparagement upon God's other book, the Word of God. I cannot help regarding in this light some of the perverse teachings of the early scientists, which often seemed to be quite anti-Christian in their implications, and which were so utterly perverse that one wonders how it was possible for such teachings ever to secure the recognition of even the most thoughtless and ignorant.

Of this latter class were those teachings, quite current for hundreds of years, or down until comparatively modern times, that the sea shells and other relics of ancient life found away up on the mountain sides, or in strata deep down in the earth, were not in reality as they seemed, the real relics of creatures that once lived and were buried where we now find them. Several

different theories were commonly advanced to account for these things, but the more common view was that they were merely the illusory freaks of nature, a sort of grotesque caricature of the living things of nature. As we look back upon the matter now from this historical distance of two centuries or more, we cannot help thinking that such a theory must have been born and propagated by a perverse spirit of evil, in a deliberate attempt to delude and deceive mankind with an utter falsehood, a falsehood which could be used to offset the real truth on this point which was in itself perfectly obvious, namely, that these things were buried where we find them by the waters of the Deluge, that great world convulsion which completely changed the face of the earth. From the many perverse falsehoods which have been palmed off on the credulous world in an effort to avoid or deny this plain truth, we are almost forced to believe that the great spirit of evil must have a special spite against this truth. If so, we can understand why in our day he has worked up such an elaborate counterfeit of it, in the shape of the popular evolutionary geology.

But we may rest assured that the plans of God concerning the truths which mankind should read from the book of nature, will eventually be carried out. The book of nature is second only to the Bible in its importance for mankind, and in the timeliness of the lessons which are to be read from it. And we may be confident that in the last days, when the great and important truths of His word are being again brought to the attention of mankind, the misunderstandings and misinterpretations which have so long obscured the real teachings of the book of nature, will also be cleared up.

But we need to understand the difference between the true interpretation of nature and that false view which has in our day become so popular. It is right for us to

interpret the past by the present, except when we come to interpret events in the past where God has especially interposed. And we are expressly told that the beginnings of things — that is, the real Creation of the world and the things in it — were of an entirely different order of events from those processes which are now going on, and which we interpret in terms of what we call natural law. The fact that Creation is stated as *a completed work*, and the fact that the Sabbath was given to mankind as a memorial of this completed work, is sufficient evidence to prove that the present is no safe guide by which to interpret the way in which Creation itself was brought about. In other words, the scientific view that the present is the correct measure of the past, is true and accurate enough until we reach the beginnings of things. But here our clue fails us. We have nothing in our present world in the way of laws or processes with which to judge of the way in which our world originated, or concerning the way in which the plants and animals were introduced upon our world. This was done by a process of direct creation, and the Bible gives us the Sabbath as the memorial of this completed Creation. But the apostle Peter pictures the scoffers of the last days as ignoring entirely this distinction between the Creation of things and the present processes of natural law under which the things of nature are sustained and perpetuated. For he pictures these scoffers as saying that all things continue from day to day in our modern world just the same as they have ever done, not from the *close* of Creation, be it noted, but “from the *beginning* of the Creation.” 2 Peter 3: 4.

In further continuation of this thought, the apostle goes on to say that these last-day mockers talk and reason in this manner because they have grown accustomed to denying the plain record of the universal Deluge,— a

record as plainly written in the book of nature as in the Bible itself. And it is a fact which every one acquainted with modern scientific history will appreciate, that the real foundation for the modern evolutionary view of the world has been based very largely upon the direct and positive denial that there ever was a universal Deluge. One has only to go back a hundred years, to near the beginning of the nineteenth century, to notice that there were men at that time, trained, scholarly students of nature, who were as well acquainted with all the scientific facts of that day as any one, and who unhesitatingly declared that the geological changes must have taken place at the time of the Deluge. And in this they made no distinction between what were termed, in that day, the "primary," and the "secondary," or the "alluvial" deposits, which afterward came to be known as the "tertiary" deposits.

But side by side with these Diluvialists, as such interpreters of geology were termed, there arose another school of scientists, headed by Charles Lyell, who were known as Uniformitarians, and who denied most positively that there ever was a great universal Deluge. These men set about to explain all the records of the rocks in terms of the present everyday action of the elements and the forces of nature. Of course, in order to succeed in making any such scheme of uniformity even a plausible explanation, it was clearly necessary to have the deposits in the rocks spread out over as much time as possible—the longer the better, from their point of view. And so there originated the idea, that only certain deposits were formed in one age of the world, and then after long periods had passed, other and different deposits were formed, these again being succeeded by others, and so on down to our day. This is the scheme of modern evolutionary geology, and upon

it has been built the imposing superstructure of organic Evolution, with Darwinism and many other isms concerned with the details. But the point to be noted here is that this system of *Uniformity*, as it is often called, is the very foundation on which the modern system of Evolution rests; and this system of Uniformity is evidently what is pointed out in the prophecy of Peter, where he says that the last-day mockers argue as they do because they declare that "all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation."

As illustrating this truth, that Uniformity in geology is the real foundation for the doctrine of Evolution, we may note the fact that Huxley declared that "Lyell with his Uniformitarianism was the chief agent in smoothing the road for Darwin;" for he declared that consistent Uniformitarianism implied a scheme of development or Evolution "as much in the biological as in the physical world."

Within recent years a most surprising change has come about, whereby Darwin and his whole scheme of organic Evolution have become quite discredited among scientists. But true to the logic of the situation, and true also to the history of the idea, these modern scientists, while acknowledging the failure of Darwinism, are shifting the burden of proof over to the geologists. That is, most well-informed modern scientists admit freely that the supposed proof of Evolution upon which they have been relying for two generations, is an acknowledged failure; but in the same breath they hasten to reaffirm their belief in the general doctrine of Evolution, saying as they do this, that the general outline of Evolution is clear enough, as given to us by the geologists.

This attitude of modern scientists is well shown by a declaration made by Dr. H. B. Scott, president of the section on Botany, before the British Association for the

Advancement of Science, in their meeting at Edinburgh, Sept. 9, 1921. Among other things, Dr. Scott spoke as follows:

"For the moment, at all events, the Darwinian period is past; we can no longer enjoy the comfortable assurance, which once satisfied so many of us, that the main problem had been solved — all is again in the melting pot. By now, in fact, a new generation has grown up that knows not Darwin.

"Yet Evolution remains — we cannot get away from it, even if we hold it only as an act of faith, for there is no alternative, and, after all, the evidence of paleontology is unshaken." — *Nature*, Sept. 29, 1921.

It may seem odd to hear a scientist talk about an "act of faith," when dealing with the subject of Evolution; for Huxley used to say that the man of faith had learned "to believe in justification, not by faith, but by verification." But it will be noted that this statement is a declaration of faith in the sole remaining hope of the Evolutionists, namely, the outline of the alleged history of successive plants and animals as given to us by the popular geology.

Practically the same thing occurred at a still more recent meeting of scientists, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which met at Toronto, during Christmas week, 1921. The star speaker at this meeting was Prof. William Bateson, M. A., F. R. S., D. Sc., of England, the leading authority in the world on the subject of heredity and genetics. The title of the lecture which he gave on the evening of December 28, and which the present writer had the privilege of hearing, was, "Evolutionary Faith and Modern Doubts." In the course of his talk he certainly gave expression to a good many "modern doubts," though he declared that his "evolutionary faith" was still strong; and he based this faith practically in the same way as we have seen Dr. Scott doing, namely, on the general facts regarding the outline of the alleged history of the plants

and animals on our world which has been furnished us by the science of geology.

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Bateson declared that he was a complete "agnostic as to the actual mode and process of Evolution." This is because of the fact that, while new types of plants and animals can be produced by hybridization, types which are seemingly as distinct as many of the species found in nature, yet the new kinds which we thus produce are in all respects cross-fertile with one another, or are fertile in back crossing with the kinds with which we started. In nature, however, species are usually cross-sterile; and in this way we have not with all our experiments produced new kinds which will in any way deserve to rank with the species found in nature. In other words, we can make varieties, and subspecies, but cannot make true species like those found in nature. Dr. Bateson went on to say:

"The survival of the fittest was a plausible account of Evolution in broad outline, but failed in application to specific differences. The Darwinian philosophy convinced us that every species must make good in nature if it is to survive, but no one can tell how the differences do, in fact, enable the species to make good. The claims of natural selection as the chief factor in the determination of species have consequently been discredited."

He also declared:

"We cannot see how the differentiation of species came about. Variations of many kinds, often considerable, we daily witness, but no origin of species. . . . Meanwhile, though our faith in Evolution stands unshaken, we have no acceptable account of the origin of species."

Elsewhere in his discourse Dr. Bateson said:

"Why may we not believe the old comfortable theory in the old way? Well, so we may, if by belief we mean faith, the foundation of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. In dim outline Evolution is evident enough. From the facts [meaning, of course, the general facts taught by geology] it is a conclusion which inevitably follows. But that particular and essential bit of the theory of

Evolution which is concerned with the origin and nature of species, remains utterly mysterious. We no longer feel as we used to do, that the process of variation, now contemporaneously occurring, is the beginning of a work which needs merely the element of time for its completion; for even time cannot complete that which has not yet begun."

The reader will notice a strong similarity between this declaration of Dr. Bateson before the American Association, and the address of Dr. Scott before the British Association. Both men declare that they cannot any longer believe in the old theories concerning the origin of plants and animals by Darwinian methods; but both men go on to affirm their continued faith in the general theory of Evolution; and both men also, remarkable as it may seem, use very similar language in holding to this doctrine merely as an "act of faith," "the foundation of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

In another part of Dr. Bateson's talk, this illustrious scientist showed that he had been thinking along the deeper problems connected with this subject, and that he saw the connection between the biological theories and the geological. For he plainly declared that the general outline of Evolution upon which he was depending was that furnished by the successive new forms of life and new orders and new species which the popular geology tells us have arisen one after another during the past history of the world. In this connection he raised the question as to how we really know that there were no mammals "in Paleozoic times." That is, Why may we not suppose that mammals were really living on the lands while the trilobites and their companions, the brachiopods and other invertebrates, were living in the ocean? Dr. Bateson confessed that he could not give absolute proof that the mammals were not contemporary with the trilobites; and he really left this part of the general problem quite unsolved.

But in reality we have here the very crux of the whole question. Personally, from my study of geology and from my study of all the other features of this subject for more than twenty years, I am free to say most positively that there is no possible way of proving that the mammals were not contemporary with the trilobites and with the other Paleozoic forms of life. I believe with all my soul that they were thus contemporary. And certainly, if any one declares that they were not thus contemporary, it is surely his business to prove his assertion. The burden of proof certainly rests on those who declare that some of these fossil forms lived in one age, and others only long afterward in an entirely subsequent age. But we all know that the popular geology has never been able to furnish even the beginnings of such proof. And herein lies its weakness. This is the tender point, the most vital point, in the whole system of anti-Biblical science. And it is high time that all Christians should understand the logic of the situation. For not only is geology unable to furnish us with any proof that all the fossils now found buried in the rocks did not once live contemporaneously together, but if we admit that all these forms were really living contemporaneously in an older state of our world, then the only possible lesson to be drawn from the rocks is that of a great universal Deluge as the story of how these rocks were formed.

For the Christian believer it is extremely gratifying to note how step by step the modern world is being brought to the position where it must soon stand face to face with that most sublime thought of the human mind, the direct Creation of all things by the immediate act of the living God. Toward such a consummation, most devoutly to be wished, we seem to be hastening with rapid pace. I cannot help believing that

ere long this great truth regarding Creation will be far more prominently and more emphatically brought to the attention of the world than it is even yet. It seems to me quite certain that the false views along this line must soon be as decidedly repudiated as we have seen other false views repudiated in recent years. Step by step backward has the vindication of these great truths gone during the last few decades; until now there seems to remain only the one crucial falsehood upon which all these other falsehoods hang, namely, the scientific denial that there ever was a universal Deluge, and the kindred falsehood, the geological assumption that the plants and animals found buried in the rocks did not live contemporaneously together in an older state of our world, but were buried in a long-drawn-out series covering hundreds of millions of years.

I cannot help thinking that the battle of the future, so far as the scientific discussion of these questions is concerned, must narrow itself down to this point, namely, *evolutionary geology or the Deluge: which shall it be?* For the one is the exact antithesis of the other. If the one is true, the other must be false; for they are mutually exclusive. They cannot both be entertained by the same mind at the same time. And, as it seems to me, we may look for a vindication of the truth of God along these lines which will call the attention of this age of evolutionists to Him who made the heaven and the earth.

Also it seems to me important that every Christian worker should become informed with reference to this present situation. He should understand that no well-informed modern scientist any longer believes in Darwinism as an explanation of how species have originated. This is an out-of-date scientific discussion. When speakers before the two great Associations for

the Advancement of Science, the British and the American, declare that they know nothing about the origin of species, and that the Darwinian period is past, it is high time that Christian workers all over the country should understand this situation, and should not go on continuing to thrash a dead lion. *The one issue now left before the scientific world, so far as these questions are concerned, is the problem connected with the geology upon which the evolution theory is logically and historically built.* And we know that this is historically and logically the weakest point in the whole theory. Those who wish to inform themselves on this subject may do so by consulting the works of the present writer.

Not merely, however, for the refutation of the prevailing errors have these modern discoveries been brought about which tend to vindicate the record given in the Bible. Our own faith needs the encouragement given by them. When the radical critics have by their doubts and questionings tended to throw a cloud of uncertainty over the Sacred Record concerning the early days of our world, and when speculating scientists have chimed in to assist them in their nefarious work, the very stones have begun to cry out, and are today mutely testifying that the records given in the early chapters of our Bible are true and righteous altogether.

“Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar.”

CHAPTER VII

CREATION AND ITS MEMORIAL

IN a previous chapter we showed that the deposits now being formed in the bottom of the ocean are wholly different in their texture and make-up from the rocks found above the ocean and under our lands. Many of these rocks of our lands are composed largely of remains of living creatures which are not found in shallow waters around the shore, but only in the deep, quiet waters of the ocean bottom.

We also showed that scientific discovery tends to prove that changes of level between the ocean and the land are not now going on, and have not occurred within the historic period.

The fact that life can come only from pre-existing life is a truth of far-reaching importance in its bearings upon the problem of origins. This fact points unmistakably to a real Creation as the only explanation of the beginnings of life on our world.

It was also pointed out that the facts of radioactivity as now known point to a real Creation of the materials of which our world is composed. The facts of radioactivity show us how the elements are constantly disintegrating and slowly changing over into other elements of less atomic weight, these changes being by loss and not by gain; so that we have in these facts a picture of the material of our world as the mechanism of a great clock slowly but surely running down. All these facts tend to show that the materials of which our universe is composed must have had an origin long ago in some way which can be described only as a real Creation.

In this chapter I wish to give some of the essential points of difference between the true doctrine of Creation and the commonly accepted theories which pass under the general name of Evolution.

There are two, and only two, theories regarding the origin of life and its various forms. One of these is the theory that they have all originated by some process similar to processes still prevailing. In modern times this theory has been called by the name of Evolution; however, the idea itself is not new, but as old as human speculation. J. G. Schurman says:

"Among the Greeks we find these five constituent elements of the modern Evolution hypothesis: The belief in the immeasurable antiquity of man, the conception of a progressive movement in the life of nature, the notion of a survival of the fittest, and the two-fold assumption that any thing, or any animal, may become another, since all things are at bottom the same."—*"Ethics of Darwinism,"* page 43.

We need not pause here to show the great similarity between the modern theories and these ancient teachings of the Greeks, which we know were essentially pagan in their nature. We are here concerned only with the contrast between these teachings and those of the Bible doctrine of Creation.

The essential idea of the Evolution theory, whether ancient or modern, may be expressed in the one word, "uniformity." That is, this theory seeks to show that the world and all it contains, including plants and animals and man, probably came into existence by causes similar to or identical with the forces and processes now prevailing in the natural world. It ignores any supernatural power behind nature, and teaches the absolute supremacy and the past continuity of fixed natural law, without any intervention or modification at any time or by any being. It says that the changes now going on in earth, and air, and sky, in the waters

of the ocean and the snows of the mountains, have prevailed backward into the remote antiquity of an unmeasured past; and that these present-day natural changes and processes are as much a part of the origin of things as anything that ever took place in the past. In short, Evolution as a philosophy of nature is an effort to *smooth out all distinction* between Creation and the ordinary processes of nature that are now under the reign of what we term "natural law." This is its essential meaning; and Darwinism and the ordinary teachings of geology are merely the details in the working out of the general theory.

I know there are some who call themselves Christian Evolutionists, or theistic Evolutionists, and who say that God made the world by the process of Evolution instead of by a direct Creation. I also know that there are many others who think they can be free to believe in some parts of the Evolution philosophy, while rejecting other parts. But I am not concerned with these partial and really inconsistent systems of belief. For as a celebrated scientist has declared, if Evolution is not universal, the germs of decay are in it. That is, if it is not an all-embracing philosophy, from mud to mind, from the starry nebula to the genius of a Newton and a Kelvin, yea, even to the Sermon on the Mount, there is something wrong with it; and sooner or later sensible people will reject it as an outgrown and inadequate philosophy. It is this all-embracing scheme of Evolution with which I am here dealing; and the multitudinous variations from this general scheme need not concern us now.

On the other hand, the essential idea of the doctrine of Creation is that, back at a definite period called the "beginning," forces and powers were brought into exercise, and results were accomplished, that have not

since been exercised or accomplished in the same unusual manner, as relates to our material world. In other words, Creation was wholly a *supra*-natural event, a direct act of a Will taking hold of and changing material conditions. That is, according to the doctrine of Creation, the origin of the first forms of life — indeed, of the very matter of which our world is composed — was essentially and absolutely different from the ways in which these forms of life are kept alive and reproduced today, that is, different from the ordinary operation of “natural law,” the same power, however, operating in both processes. Heb. 1: 1-3.

Time is in no way the essential idea in this doctrine of Creation. The question of how much time was occupied in this first work of Creation is of no importance philosophically, neither is the question of how long ago it took place. The one essential idea is that in its nature Creation is necessarily beyond our possible knowledge, a purely miraculous event. We can never hope to know just how it was accomplished. We cannot expect to understand the process or the details, because we have nothing with which to measure it. We have neither the data nor the faculties for understanding it. The one essential thing in the doctrine of Creation is that the origin of our world and of the things upon it came about at some period of time in the past by a direct creative act of divine power; and that since this original Creation, quite different processes have prevailed to maintain and perpetuate the world and the various kinds of life which were then called into existence.

With these two statements of the contrast between the Evolution doctrine and the doctrine of Creation, it is easy to see that they are exactly opposite to each other. If the one is true, the other must be false. The

two ideas cannot be entertained by the same mind, unless that mind is badly confused in its thinking.

The meanings of these two ideas, as stated above, immediately suggest how we might test them out by a strictly scientific investigation. Thus, the Evolution doctrine might be established by showing that life can now be made from the not-living; and that new and distinct forms of life can be produced in our laboratories, or by our experiments in growing plants and breeding animals. If these events could be observed taking place in our modern world, they would practically demonstrate the theory of Evolution as an explanation of the origin of things. If even one of these events could be seen taking place at the present time, it would tend just that far to give support to this theory of Evolution.

On the other hand, a real Creation at some time in the past can in effect be demonstrated as a true historical event, if we can show that, in spite of the efforts to the contrary of two generations of scientists, equipped with all the technique and facilities of modern laboratory methods, the forces and processes now in operation under natural law do not account for the origin of things; that life, and the various kinds of life, must all have had an origin essentially different from anything now going on around us.

In the light of the modern scientific discoveries which have already been given in these pages, it is easy to see that the doctrine of Creation is as well established as we can expect any abstract truth to be established by scientific investigation. The Evolution doctrine has had a fair chance and an open field for more than half a century. Thousands of eager investigators, equipped with all the facilities of modern scientific methods, have been working on the details of these problems, very

many of them with the determined purpose of demonstrating the truth of their favorite philosophy. But on both the essential points mentioned above these investigators have completely and absolutely failed; and today the theory of Evolution may be regarded as utterly bankrupt. In contrast with this failure, indeed exactly because of this failure, the opposite doctrine of a real Creation stands out bright and clear as the only explanation of the origin of things which has stood the test of scientific experiment and investigation.

This is surely a very wonderful situation; and it becomes all the more wonderful and interesting to those who have for a generation or more been observing the Sabbath as a memorial of a real Creation accomplished at some definite time in the past. For the Sabbath has been given to the race as a memorial, not of a process still going on, but of a definite, accomplished fact, a *completed* Creation. Thus we see how appropriate the Sabbath becomes as a protest against any false idea about the world's origin, and especially against the modern theory of Uniformity or Evolution.

There are in the Bible other references to this fact of a completed Creation. The author of the book of Hebrews says, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3. Doubtless this last expression refers primarily to the origin of the materials of which our world is composed, thus denying the eternity of matter; but without any abuse of terms, it can also be understood to refer to the method of Creation in general. Similarly we are told in the same book that "the works [of Creation] were finished from the foundation of the world." Heb. 4:3. True, Jesus said on one occasion, "My Father worketh even until now, and I

work" (John 5:17, A. R. V.); but this language of the Master does not in the least imply that the method of Creation was similar to, or commensurate with, the present order of nature. Christ's evident meaning is that God did not start the world running and leave it to run itself. He still cares for the things which He has made; but this care is exercised in ways and methods which are distinctly different from the way by which these things were first brought into existence.

According to the record in Genesis, the Sabbath was given to the race, not only as a reminder of the fact that God created the world and the creatures upon it in six literal days of the same length and character as the seventh, or Sabbath, but also as a reminder that God made man *holy*, merely "a little lower than the angels;" and that all the world, when thus made, was perfect, and not as it is now, stained with sin and shadowed by disease and death. Man is not a rising creature, but a fallen one; and the Sabbath which he brought with him from Eden is a souvenir, or reminder, of his long-lost home, and is a protest against the idea that he was made as we now find him, or on any lower plane or in any less developed state of being. Moreover, it becomes also a pledge or promise of the time when the bright, happy conditions of Eden will be restored to our troubled world.

We are familiar with the idea that the Sabbath is not only a memorial of Creation, but also a sign of the soul's second creation, its new birth. (See Eze. 20:12; Ex. 31:13.) And as the Sabbath may rightly be regarded as a standing protest against all pagan or evolutionary theories of the world's origin, so likewise it becomes also a protest against the related idea, which is so prevalent in our day, of salvation by culture or development.

We have also long been familiar with the idea that redemption is a re-creation, and that in the relationship of the creature to the Creator is laid the ultimate and changeless foundation of any true system of ethics and morality. Hence the Sabbath, which is the sign or reminder of this relationship, becomes the sign or reminder of all moral obligation,—the reminder of our duty to worship the Creator, and also of our duty to love our neighbor, who like ourselves has been made by this same Father. In view of the fact that the world has largely forgotten all this, we see how very appropriate and timely it is for God now to call upon all in this age of Evolutionists:

“Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” Rev. 14: 7.

In our day, thousands of earnest Christians have dedicated their lives to the unfaltering purpose of giving the gospel to the world in this generation. And it seems to the present writer that not only have the natural forces of nature — steam, electricity, and the wireless, in all their many forms — been commissioned by the Author of nature to assist in this world evangelization; but these important truths regarding a universal Deluge and a literal Creation, as modern discoverers are revealing them, are of just such a character as to give power and timeliness to all that the church of these days may attempt to do for a practically pagan America and Europe, as well as for a pagan China and India. These truths regarding the records given in the first part of the Bible must necessarily be a vital part of any message which the church may attempt to give to the world based on the predictions of the last part of the Bible. The truth regarding that Eden world which man lost through transgression, must be a vital part

of any form of the gospel which would undertake to tell the world of the new heavens and the new earth which will be restored to man again through the victory won for him by the second Adam.

Under such a banner as this, and with such a message, the church cannot fail. She must conquer. Not that all will receive her message; but those who love their Lord will rejoice when convinced that He is soon to return again to take His waiting people to Himself. And in that day, when the opening heavens shall reveal to the expectant church the form of her returning Lord and Master, the people who are ready to welcome Him will not be those who have doubted and compromised, who have believed the teachings of skeptical scientists rather than the plain teachings of that Guidebook which was left with the church as her infallible guide. Happy will it be for you and for me if in that day we have believed that this Guidebook is truer and more accurate than the wisdom of all the wise.

